

REMARKS

The Office Action dated April 27, 2009 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claims 1 and 3 have been amended and new claims 6-14 have been added. Claims 1, 6 and 10 are the only independent claims. Reconsideration of the above-identified application, as amended and in view of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

The examiner has objected to the title of the invention being non descriptive and provided a suggested title. Applicants thank the examiner for this suggestion and have so amended the title. Consequently, applicant respectfully requests the objection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Egawa, U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0041500 (hereinafter "Egawa"). Claims 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Egawa in view of Hoelen et al., U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0035853.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with, and explicitly traverses, the examiner's reason for rejecting the claims.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

A display apparatus with a display unit, having means for background lighting at a side or the back of the display apparatus, characterized in that the means for background lighting comprise two illumination units being provided at the right-hand and left-hand of the display apparatus, said illumination units being formed as substantially vertically positioned, longitudinal light guides comprising means for coupling out light, each of the light guides being provided on both of its ends with a light source [emphasis added].

Egawa et al teaches a spread illuminating apparatus used as an illuminating means for a liquid crystal display device (Abstract). Egawa does not teach or imply the newly added feature of claim 1 that a light source is provided to both ends of each light source. Support for this feature is found, *inter alia*, in Fig. 3B (and corresponding paragraph [0020] of the specification) and Fig. 5 (and corresponding paragraph [0025] of the specification)

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element recited therein is expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. Egawa cannot be said to anticipate the present invention, because Egawa fails to disclose each and every element recited. As shown, Egawa fails to disclose the feature of "each of the light guides being provided on both of its ends with a light source" as is recited in claim 1.

Having shown that Egawa fails to disclose each and every element claimed, applicant submits that the reason for the Examiner's rejection of claim 1 has been overcome and can no longer be sustained. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 1.

Newly added claim 6 essentially combines the features of original claims 1 and 3. Further, the claim language now recites that the rotation of the light guides permits adjustment of the back light pattern. Support for this feature is found, *inter alia*, in the specification at paragraph [0007]. The Office Action had rejected original claim 3 by pointing to Fig. 3 of Egawa and noting that the light guides can be rotated 180 degrees ... [they] can each be switched” (Office Action, page 3, last paragraph). This feature of Egawa fails to address the feature of claim 6 wherein the rotation of the light guides yields an adjustment of the back light pattern. Accordingly, claim 6 is deemed patentable over Egawa.


Newly added claim 10 adds the feature that “the means for background lighting produces a back light pattern on a wall” to the features of the original claim 1. Support for this feature is found, *inter alia*, in the specification at paragraph [0007]. Egawa fails to teach or suggest this feature of claim 10. Accordingly, claim 10 is deemed patentable over Egawa.

With regard to claims 2-5, 7-9, and 11-14 these claims ultimately depend from on of the independent claims, which have been shown to be not anticipated and allowable in view of the cited references. Accordingly, claims 2-5, 7-9, and 11-14 are also allowable by virtue of their dependence from an allowable base claim.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all the present claims are patentable in view of the cited references. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Piotrowski
Registration No. 42,079



By: Thomas Onka
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 42,053

Date: July 26, 2009

Mail all correspondence to:
Dan Piotrowski, Registration No. 42,079
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9624
Fax: (914) 332-0615

Certificate of Mailing/Transmission Under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to MAIL STOP AMENDMENT, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA, VA. 22313-1450 or transmitted by facsimile to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No (571) 273-8300 on 7/26/09

THOMAS J. ONKA
(Name of Registered Rep.)

Thomas Onka 7/26/09
(Signature and Date)